

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,787	10/29/2003	Nancy Anne Federspiel	6616-72707-02	1171
7590 05/16/2007 One World Trade Center, Suite 1600 121 S.W. Salmon Street Portland, OR 97204		7	EXAMINER	
			IBRAHIM, MEDINA AHMED	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1638	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		·	05/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/697,787	FEDERSPIEL ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner					
•		Art Unit				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	Medina A. Ibrahim	1638				
Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirn will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ARANDONE.	. nely filed the mailing date of this communication.				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 Ma	arch 2007					
_						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E						
Disposition of Claims	,					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3-11</u> is/are pending in the application.						
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>4 and 8-10</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3.5-7 and 11</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement					
Application Papers						
<u> </u>	_	•				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
	amilier. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
÷						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	A) Intension Comme	(DTO 412)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date.						
B) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) ☐ Other:						
i apei ivo(s)/iviali Date	6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/29/07 has been entered.

Claims 3-11 are pending.

Claims 4 and 8-10, drawn to the non-elected invention are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 3 and 5-7 and 11 are examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This rejection is repeated for the reasons of record as set forth in the last Office actions. Applicant's arguments filed 03/29/07 have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive.

Applicant asserts that the last Office action indicated that Arabidopsis sequences are described, therefore the claims are now amended to recite an Arabidopsis ortholog of SEQ ID NO: 2. This assertion is incorrect because the claims as

Art Unit: 1638

amended do not recite any of the disclosed Arabidopsis sequences or any structurefunction element that would distinguish the claimed Arabidopsis ortholog from other
known or unknown pathogen/drought resistant genes from Arabidopsis including A.
thaliana. MPEP 2163 and related case law Eli Lilly, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at
1406; Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical, 927 F.2d 1200, 1206, 18 USPQ2d 1016,
1021 (Fed. Cir. 1991) state "one must define a compound by "whatever characteristics
sufficiently distinguish it". Therefore, the claims drawn to an Arabidopsis ortholog of
SEQ ID NO: 2 are not adequately described for the reasons of record.

An amendment to claims 3 and 5 to delete "an Arabidopsis ortholog of SEQ ID NO: 2", would obviate the above rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Art Unit: 1638

Claims 3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Thomashow et al. (US 6, 417, 428, filed 11/23/1998).

The claims are broadly drawn to a transgenic plant comprising a plant transformation vector comprising a nucleotide sequence that encodes an Arabidopsis ortholog of SEQ ID NO: 2 under the control of a drought inducible promoter, and a method of increasing drought tolerance in a transgenic plant by transforming said vector with said plant. The claims are also drawn to plants and plant parts produced by said method.

Thomashow et al teach plants transformed with an expression vector comprising a DNA from Arabidopsis thaliana encoding a protein having an AP2 domain capable of binding to the DNA regulatory sequence and inducing expression of one or more environmental stress tolerance genes; and a drought inducible promoter. Thomashow et al also teach a method of increasing environmental stress tolerance including drought and disease in a plant comprising transforming the plant with said expression vector, and producing transgenic plants and plant parts having enhanced stress tolerance. The cited reference also teaches that the stress inducible promoter includes drought inducible promoter. The cited reference also teaches transformation and regeneration of plants. The DNA of the prior art encoding a protein having AP2 domain is considered to be an ortholog of SEQ ID NO: 2, given that the prior art DNA is also from Arabidopsis thaliana that induces drought tolerance and/or disease resistance upon expression in a transgenic plant. Absent evidence to the contrary, all claim limitations are disclosed by the reference.

Art Unit: 1638

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 3, 5-7 and 11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 and 11-14 of copending Application No. 10/512,600. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in both applications are drawn to transgenic plants comprising a plant transformation vector comprising a polynucleotide encoding SEQ ID NO: 2 and variants having % sequence identity thereof, methods of producing transgenic plants with said vector, and plants and plant parts produced by said methods. The only difference between the two applications is that the DNA encoding SEQ ID NO: 2 has been used in the instant application to induce

Art Unit: 1638

Page 6

drought resistance in the transgenic plants, while the same DNA is used in the copending application to induce pathogen resistance in the transgenic plants. However, both the drought and disease resistance activities are inherent properties of SEQ ID NO: 2. Also, the use of drought or inducible promoter in the transformation vector would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Remarks

No claim is allowed.

Contact information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Medina A. Ibrahim whose telephone number is (571) 272-0797. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday -Thursday from 8:00AM to 5:30PM and every other Friday from 9:00AM to 5:00 PM. Before and after final responses should be directed to fax nos. (703) 872-9306 and (703) 872-9307, respectively.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Anne Marie Grunberg, can be reached at (571) 272-0975.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-

786-9199.

5/13/07

Mai

MEDINA A. IBRAHIM
PRIMARY EXAMINER A-WORL